REMARKS

Initially, applicants would like to express their appreciation to the Examiner for discussing this case with applicants' representative on August 2, 2004. In accordance with the discussion, the present paper is being submitted.

Claims 1, 5, 6 - 8, 10, 13 - 15, 17, and 19 - 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over KURLANDER. The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 10, 17, and 22 - 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over KURLANDER in view of ASTLE. The examiner has rejected claims 4, 11, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over KURLANDER in view of KLIENMAN. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 1, 8, and 15 recite zooming each frame, which includes a balloon portion. KURLANDER's "zoom does not affect balloons." See col. 13, line 40. Moreover, KURLANDER does not teach or suggest displaying frame by frame by zooming. In contrast, as recited at col. 13, lines 48 - 51, KURLANDER's frame by frame display is enabled by scrolling. Consequently, for at least these reasons it is requested that the Examiner provide an indication of the allowability of claims 1, 8, and 15.

Claims 3, 5 - 7, 10, 12 - 14, 17, and 19 - 21 have been amended to recite a skimming mode and a careful reading mode. Support for the amendments is provided, *inter alia*, by Figs. 30 and 31. It is submitted that none of the applied references teach

such a feature. Accordingly, it is requested that the Examiner provide an indication of allowability of claims 3, 5 - 7, 10, 12 - 14, 17, and 19 - 21.

Although ASTLE generally refers to fade in/out processing, the reference does not disclose fading a specific frame, as recited in claims 3, 10, and 17.

Part by part display of words within a balloon is not shown by KURLANDER. The reference discloses user entered data in a dialog box. It appears that the entire passage is displayed within the balloon portion at one time, after the user finishes entering text data. See col. 7, lines 1 - 33. Thus, the features of claims 5, 12, and 20 do not appear to be taught or suggested by the applied references.

Finally, claims 6, 13, and 20 recite fading words. The applied references do not disclose or suggest such a feature.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding rejections and an indication of the allowability of all of the pending claims.

Dependent claims 4, 11, 18, and 22 - 24 all depend from independent claims 1, 8, and 15 and are believed allowable for the same reasons stated above, in addition to reasons related to their own recitations. For example, claims 4, 11, and 18 recite storing data in at least two languages. The cited portion of the applied reference does not refer to storing text data for two languages. Rather, it states that text strings can be translated to another language without re-specifying their position. Storing, rather than translating,

reduces processing. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that an indication of the allowability of all the claims currently pending in the present application is provided.

Any amendments to the claims in this amendment that have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Entry of the present amendment is believed to be proper, even though a Final Office Action has been issued. That is, it is believed that no new issues have been raised that would require further search or consideration by the Examiner.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Hiroshi MINAGAWA et al.

Reg. No. 48,063

Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

August 4, 2004
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191